

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-30, 33 and 35 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of February 4, 2009 all claims are rejected. With this response, no claims are amended, added or cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In section 3, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-30, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,733) in view of Sturniolo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,962). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest establishing a further connection between a proxy module and a remote service of a network through a selected access point so as to establish a communication connection between the terminal device and the network for the application client, as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The Office acknowledges on page 3 of the Office Action that Takagi fails to disclose the above mentioned limitation of claim 1, and relies upon Sturniolo for this teaching. Sturniolo discloses multiple local area networks. A communication system according to Sturniolo includes a plurality of local area network (LANs). Each of the LANs includes a network backbone, and at least one access point coupled to the network backbone, which when a mobile terminal is registered to the access point, enables the mobile terminal to communicate wirelessly with a device on the network backbone via the at least one access point. When the mobile terminal is registered to at least one access point in one of the plurality of LANs the mobile terminal is assigned a first network address, and when the mobile terminal is registered to at least one access point in another of the plurality of LANs the mobile terminal is assigned a second network address in place of the first network address.

The second network address is different from the first network address. The mobile communication system also includes a system backbone interconnecting the plurality of LANs for permitting communications between the plurality of LANs. Furthermore, the system includes a gateway controller, operatively coupled to one of the plurality of LANs, for serving as an intermediary for communications between the mobile terminal and a device on one of the system backbones in order that in the event the mobile terminal is assigned a different network address by virtue of registering with an access point in another of the LANs, the device is able to maintain communications with the mobile terminal without requiring knowledge of a change in the network address of the mobile terminal.

In contrast to claim 1, Sturniolo only discloses that the connection with the terminal is maintained inside the cell coverage and inside the LAN, but when a mobile terminal wishes to roam from one LAN to another the mobile terminal typically must disassociate itself from one LAN and reassociate itself with another LAN. See Sturniolo column 2, lines 14-17. Sturniolo further discusses that a real time hand over would add more complexity. See Sturniolo column 2, lines 18-20. However, claim 1 specifically recites selecting an access point among a plurality of access points in the terminal device, and therefore claim 1 is not concerned with selecting an access point of a remote network, where the access point is located outside of the terminal device. Instead, as shown in Figures 3 and 4 of the present application, the method of claim 1 is carried out inside the terminal device. Therefore, Sturniolo fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Takagi acknowledged by the Office, and applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claims 16, 33 and 35 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1, and are rejected for similar reasons. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 16, 33 and 35 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The claims rejected above, and depending from the above mentioned independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.


Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims of the application are allowable, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 15 Apr. 1 2009

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051